

## REMARKS

Endale Haile-mariam, the Inventor, wishes to thank Mr. Khaled Brown, the Examiner, for the courteous interview granted on July 31, 2002. The reasons set forth at the interview as warranting favorable action are set forth below.

In addition, the Office Action dated March 28, 2001 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested. Claims 4-13, 15-23, 25-29, and 31-35 remain in this application, claims 36-54 being canceled without prejudice, claims 3, 14, 24 and 30 being amended by this response.

### **Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 36-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 no longer apply because Claims 36-54 have been abandoned.

### **Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gale et al (US 5692820) in view of Rohr (US 4708312).

Claims 3, 14, 24 and 30 have been amended to overcome this rejection, by adding "non-transmissive" limitation to the reflective screen component of the invention. Transmissive screens permit some light to pass through the screen material and some to reflect back like the transparent screen of Gale's invention. However, the screen of the current invention does not allow any light to pass through the screen material with all of the light to reflecting back because of its "non-transmissive" nature. This is one of the important differences between Gale et al and the current invention in understanding the novelty and non-obviousness of each invention.

Gale et al has a projection system designed to create the final computer image on a transparent screen. The reflective screen (Col 2, Line 2) described is the final viewing screen, a transparent screen, where the image appears to the computer user. In contrast, the projection monitor of the invention is based on a non-transmissive reflective screen instead of a transparent screen. It is not obvious to invent a method of creating a projection monitor using a non-transmissive reflective screen rather than a transparent screen. Further, it is not obvious to create an eyestrain reduction method based on the projection monitor of the invention. Therefore,

reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-13 and 24-29 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-13 and 25-29, being dependent upon and further limiting independent claims 3 and 24 should also be allowable for that reason, as well as the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rohr does suggest using an adjustable arm (Col 1, Line 43) with a "vedio display apparatus or the like." The vedio display apparatus could be a CRT or even Gale et al projection monitor. However, Rohr does not suggest, teach or provide motivation to create a new display application using existing vedio display apparatus. The projection monitor of Gale is fundamentally the same display application on the adjustable arm of Rohr. The image size is still constrained by the size of the enclosure and transparent screen regardless of the position of the arm. Rohr does not suggest using a projector, a non-transmissive reflective screen, with an adjustable arm to invent a novel method of creating a projection monitor.


With the adjustable arm, the projection monitor of the invention takes no desk space and has the ability to create larger image sizes with a greater degree of freedom in varying the image size. Consequently, it is not obvious to invent another method of creating a projection monitor of the invention by using an adjustable arm. Further, it is not obvious to invent another eyestrain reduction method using the projection monitor of the invention with an adjustable arm. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14-23 and 30-35 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 15-23 and 31-35 being dependent upon and further limiting independent claims 14 and 30 should also be allowable for that reason, as well as the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Inventor believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this application is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 8, 2002



---

Endale G. Haile-mariam  
2712 Henderson Ave  
Wheaton, MD 20902  
P: (301) 962-9220  
F: (301) 962-8126